The Affirmative’s focus on whiteness/blackness renders invisible the colonization of Native American lands as the founding point of modernity, and insulates whiteness from any serious challenge. **Moreton-Robinson 08**[[1]](#footnote-1)

The field of Whiteness studies is not a uniquely white enterprise, African Americans have commented on and written about whiteness since the early 1800s.7 African American scholarship has been influential, particularly the work of W. E. B. Du Bois and more recently Toni Morrison whose seminal text Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination challenged the naturalized whiteness of American literature by illuminating how the omnipresence of African Americans has historically shaped it. 8 She exposes the embedded racial assumptions that enable whiteness to characterize itself in the literary imagination in powerful and important ways. In her analysis of Hemmingway’s To Have and to Have Not, Morrison illustrates how black men and women were positioned as inferiors within his texts to prop up white masculinity.9 Morrison further suggests in “Black Matters” that the African American presence has also “shaped the body politic, the Constitution, and the entire history of the [USA] culture.”10 Indigenous peoples are outside the scope of Morrison’s analysis. Through the centering of the African American presence, **Native American texts that have challenged**, resisted **and affected** the American literary imagination, **politics**, history and the Constitution **remain invisible.** This silence is an interesting discursive move considering that the best-selling novels within the USA in the late eighteenth century were captivity narratives. And as Native American legal scholar Raymond Williams argues it was **the positioning of Indians as** incommensurable **savages** within the Declaration of Independence that **enabled “‘the Founders’ vision of America**’s growth and potentiality **as a new form of** expansionary **white racial dictatorship** in the world.”11 The most valuable contribution of Morrison’s work for my purposes is her thesis that “**blackness**,” whether real or imagined, services the social construction and application of whiteness in its myriad forms. In this way it **is utilized as a white epistemological possession**. Her work opens up a space for considering how this possessiveness operates within the whiteness studies literature to displace Indigenous sovereignties and render them invisible. WHITE POSSESSIVENESS **Most historians mark 1492** **as the year when imperialism began to construct the old world order by taking possession of other people**, their lands and resources. **The possessive nature of this enterprise informed** the development of a **racial stratification** process **on a global scale** that became solidified during modernity. **Taking possession of Indigenous people’s lands was a** quintessential **act of colonization and was tied to the transition from the Enlightenment to modernity**, which precipitated the emergence of a new subject into history within Europe. Major social, legal, economic and political reforms had taken place changing the feudal nature of the relationship between persons and property in the 16th and 18th centuries. “These changes centered upon the rise of ‘possessive individualism,’ that is, upon an increasing consciousness of the distinctness of each self-owning human entity as the primary social and political value.”12 Private ownership of property both tangible and intangible operated through mechanisms of the new nation state in its regulation of the population and especially through the law. By the late 1700s people could legally enter into different kinds of contractual arrangements whereby they could own land, sell their labor and possess their identities all of which were formed through their relationship to capital and the state. **A new white property owning subject emerged into history and possessiveness became embedded in everyday discourse** as “a firm belief that the best in life was the expansion of self through property and property began and ended with possession of one’s body.”13 Within the realm of intra-subjectivity possession can mean control over one’s being, ideas, one’s mind, one’s feelings and one’s body or within inter-subjectivity it can mean the act or fact of possessing something that is beyond the subject and in other contexts it can refer to a state of being possessed by another. Within the law possession can refer to holding or occupying territory with or without actual ownership or a thing possessed such as property or wealth and it can also refer to territorial domination of a state. At an ontological level **the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will**, thus it is open to being possessed. This enables the formally free subject to make the thing its own. Ascribing one’s own subjective will onto the thing is required to make it one’s property as “willful possession of what was previously a will-less thing constitutes our primary form of embodiment; it is invoked whenever we assert: this is mine.”14 To be able to assert ‘this is mine’ requires a subject to internalize the idea that one has proprietary rights that are part of normative behavior, rules of interaction and social engagement. Thus possession that forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity is reinforced by its sociodiscursive functioning. WHITE WRITING A number of texts have been written historicizing the acquisition of white identity and the privileges conferred by its status through a trope of migration, which is based on the assumption that all those who came after the white people had taken possession are the immigrants. **White possession of the nation works discursively** within these texts **to displace Native American sovereignties by disavowing that everyone else within the USA are immigrants**

whether they came in chains or by choice. **The only displacement that is theorized is in relation to African Americans**. Theodore Allen’s work on how the Irish became white in America illustrates that the transformation of their former status as the blacks of Europe relied on their displacement by African Americans in the new country.15 David Roediger discusses how the wages of whiteness operated to prevent class alliances between working class whites and African Americans.16 Karen Brodkin’s excellent book on how Jews became white demonstrates that the lower status of African American workers enabled Jewish class mobility.17 Jacobsen illustrates that European migrants were able to become white through ideological and political means that operated to distinguish them from African American blackness.18 **The black/white binary permeates these analyses enabling tropes of migration and slavery to work covertly** in these texts **erasing the** continuing history of colonization and **the Native American** sovereign **presence**. **Blackness becomes an epistemological possession** that Allen, Roediger, Brodkin and Jacobsen deploy in analyzing whiteness and race, **which forecloses the possibility that the dispossession of Native Americans was tied to** migration and **the establishment of slavery** driven by the logic of capital. **Slaves were brought to America as the property of white people to work** the **land** that was **appropriated from Native America tribes**. Subsequently, migration became a means to enhance capitalist development within the USA. Migration, slavery and the dispossession of Native Americans were integral to the project of nation building. Thus **the question of how anyone came to be white or black in the U**nited **S**tates of America **is** inextricably **tied to the dispossession of the original owners** and the assumption of white possession. The various assumptions of sovereignty beginning with British ‘settlers’ the formation of individual states and subsequently the United States of America all came into existence through the blood-stained taking of Native American land. The USA as a white nation state cannot exist without land and clearly defined borders, **it is the** legally defined and asserted **territorial sovereignty that provides the context for national identifications of whiteness**. In this way I argue Native American dispossession indelibly marks configurations of white national identity. Ruth Frankenberg acknowledges in the introduction to her edited collection Displaying Whiteness that whiteness traveled culturally and physically, impacting on the formation of nationhood, class and empire sustained by imperialism and global capitalism. She wrote that notions of race were tied “to ideas about legitimate ‘ownership’ of the nation, with ‘whiteness’ and ‘Americanness’ linked tightly together” and that this history was repressed. After making this statement she then moves on to discuss immigration and its effects.19 Her acknowledgement did not progress into critical analysis that centered Native American dispossession, instead Frankenberg represses that which she acknowledges is repressed. Repression operates as a defense mechanism to protect one’s perception of self and reality from an overwhelming trauma that may threaten in order to maintain one’s self image. **Repressing** the history of **Native American dispossession works to protect the** possessive **white self from ontological disturbance.** **It is** far **easier to extricate oneself from** the history of **slavery if there were no** direct family and material **ties to its institution and reproduction.** However, **it is not as easy to distance one’s self from** a history of **Indigenous dispossession when one benefits everyday** from being tied to a nation that has and continues to constitute itself as a white possession. Within the whiteness studies literature whiteness has been defined in multiple ways. It is usually perceived as unnamed, unmarked and invisible, and often as culturally empty operating only by appropriation and absence.20 It is a location of structural privilege, a subject position and cultural praxis.21 Whiteness constitutes the norm operating within various institutions influencing decision making and defining itself by what it is not.22 It is socially constructed and is a form of property that one possesses, invests in and profits from.23 Whiteness as a social identity works discursively becoming ubiquitous, fluid and dynamic24 operating invisibly through pedagogy.25 What these different definitions of whiteness expose is that it is something that can be possessed and it is tied to power and dominance despite being fluid, vacuous and invisible to white people. However, these different **conceptualizations of whiteness**, which use blackness as an epistemological possession to service what it is not, **obscure the** more complex **way** that **white possession functions** sociodiscursively through subjectivity and knowledge production. As something that can be possessed by subjects it must have ontological and epistemological anchors in order to function through power. As a means of controlling differently racialized populations enclosed within the borders of a given society, white subjects are disciplined, though to different degrees, to invest in the nation as a white possession that imbues them with a sense of belonging and ownership. This sense of belonging is derived from ownership as understood within the logic of capital and citizenship. In its self-legitimacy, white possession operates discursively through narratives of the home of the brave and the land of the free and through white male signifiers of the nation such as the Founding Fathers, the ‘pioneer’ and the ‘war hero.’ **Against this stands the Indigenous sense of belonging, home and place** in its sovereign incommensurable difference.

The impact is ongoing, systemic violence against Native Americans and a solvency takeout. The Aff leaves core Enlightenment principles untouched, ensuring that whiteness can never be replaced by indigenous modalities.

**Moreton-Robinson 08**[[2]](#footnote-2)

Despite the colonial history of the United States and racializing Native Americans in popular culture, as the embodiment of ‘redness,’ the whiteness literature makes a racial demarcation between African Americans and Native Americans. That is **by making blackness synonymous with ‘race’ African Americans are placed in a reified position** within the literature. **This binary understanding** of ‘race’ **places the literature** in one sense **out of colonial history**. That is the theorizing about whiteness does not begin with nor center the appropriation of **Indigenous peoples’ lands and the continuing sovereignty struggles** with the US nation state. They **are**, but they are **marginalized** within the theories of race and whiteness offered by whiteness studies despite its political commitment to and epistemological engagement with white race privilege and power. **The conceptual links between the privileges** and benefits **that flow from** **American citizenship** **to Native American dispossession remains invisible**. **Instead slavery**, war **and migration are the narratives by which** the historically contingent positionality of **whiteness unfolds**. **This reflects a failure to address the** sociodiscursive **way that white possession functions to produce racism**. The racism attending the sociodiscursive nature of white possession informed the establishment of the Advisory Board of Race in 1997. President Clinton established this Board to counsel and inform him about race and racial reconciliation couching the terms of reference within a civil rights framework.44 No Native American representative was appointed to the Board even though they are the only racial group required to carry a blood quantum card as proof of tribal membership.45 This exclusion was the catalyst for numerous protests by different Native American groups. They stated that while Native Americans shared with other racial groups the need for improving their socioeconomic and legal conditions, there were other conditions not shared. They argued that their position within the USA was unique because of their sovereignties and treating with the Nation State. The racism that they experience is predicated on this relationship. Native American sovereignty is constantly under threat by the Nation State and its various mechanisms of governance such as the Plenary Powers of the United States Congress. **Within their daily lives they experience** the effects of **broken treaties, loss of land** **and** cultural rights, **genocide** and breaches of fiduciary duty. They are confronted by the constant battle with Congressmen and State Governors who wish to diminish their rights by framing “the economic and political empowerment of Indigenous tribes as evidence of a threatening tribal movement to transgress the temporal and spatial boundaries of colonial rule, consume American property and colonise the American political system.”46 Resisting and **diminishing Native American sovereignties** also **includes tactics such as positioning their claims outside racism which serves to** protect and **reinscribe** possessive investments in the nation as a **white possession**. Some twelve months after its establishment, President Clinton was invited to discuss his Race Advisory Board with a panel of eight people on a PBS broadcast. One member of the panel was Native American Sherman Alexie. The panel discussed with Clinton a number of race issues including affirmative action. During the show Clinton did not address Native American sovereignty claims but tried to connect with Alexie by informing him that his grandmother was one-quarter Cherokee. Later in the program Alexie was asked if he was often engaged by others in discussions about race to which he replied that a dialogue often takes place when he is approached by people who “tell me they’re Cherokee.”47 In other words people do not talk about racism to Alexie unless they claim some form of Indigeneity. Alexie’s comment serves to illustrate how Clinton tries to capitalize on a Native American ancestry by staking a possessive claim to a subject position that is not purely white in order to connect with his native brother while having excluded Native Americans from the Race Committee. Clinton can stake a possessive claim to Cherokee descent because there is no threat to his investment in his white identity, which carries a great deal of cultural capital enabling him to make the claim on biological grounds outside of Cherokee sovereignty. What Clinton was also signifying to the audience was that race does not matter: even a person of Cherokee descent can be President of the United States because this is the land of freedom, liberty and equality. A similar rhetorical strategy was also deployed in March 2008 by Barack Obama in his speech on race in Philadelphia, which was framed by the black/white binary operationalizing narratives of slavery and migration. Obama declared that slavery was the original sin in the making of the nation and it is the African American experience that dominates his speech though he acknowledges Latinos, Hispanics and refers to Native Americans once. His narrative on migration is reserved for white working and middle class people who he says feel they have not been privileged by their race, they have worked hard to build their dream but are now victims of globalization. Obama stakes a possessive claim to whiteness throughout this speech by discursively operationalizing an American dream which is beyond race. He stages this through an appeal to Christian principles, civil rights, patriotism, citizenship, liberty, freedom and equality noting that the Declaration of Independence was developed by men who “travelled across an ocean to escape tyranny and persecution.”48 The tyranny and persecution inflicted upon Native Americans and slaves by white male possessors who framed the constitution is disavowed by Obama, who epitomizes them as the bearers of freedom and liberty. Clinton’s executive and personal actions and Obama’s speech serve to negate Native American claims that race and racism were operating, when Indigenous peoples were dispossessed, and they continue to mark their everyday lives and sovereignty claims. The genealogy of racism toward Native Americans can be traced back to “Greek and Roman myths of warlike, barbarian tribes and biblical accounts of wild men cursed by God” which informed renaissance era travel narratives describing them as the embodiment of primitive human savagery.49 **Enlightenment theorists** such as Locke and Hobbes **developed their ideas of the state** of nature **utilizing the American Indian as** the quintessential example of “humanity living in its pure, unadulterated **savage** state.”50 **These ideas operated discursively to inform theories about the rights of man within** the context of the rise of **democracy relegating Indigenous people to a state of nature** without any sovereign rights. They continue to circulate **preventing Indigenous sovereignties from gaining recognition as** relevant and **alternative visions of differently constituted modernities** and global futures. The exclusion of Native Americans from the Race Committee correlates with their invisibility within the whiteness literature. **Native Americans are located outside ‘racism’ because U**nited **S**tates**’** **status as a former colony** and its current mode of colonization **is separated from its historical narrative** as being the land of liberty, freedom and equality.

Their link of omission holds them uniquely responsible for the structural violence and genocide inflicted on Native Americans. **Ashley et al. 99**[[3]](#footnote-3)

**Failure to dispel stereotypes is of particular concern because** several scholars have noted how **certain target populations become socially constructed as either "deserving" or "undeserving"** groups**, and** further that **"deserving" groups** generally **become beneficiaries of public polices while "undeserving" groups** ("the other") **remain** targets of public policymaking that serves to **disadvantage[d]** them**.** Social constructions of groups rely on stereotypes. According to Schneider and Ingram, The social construction of potential target populations refers to the images, stereotypes, and beliefs that confer identities on people and connect them with others as a social group who are possible candidates for receiving beneficial or burdensome policy. Social constructions of social groups are created by politics, culture, socialization, history, the media, literature, religion and the like. The social construction of knowledge refers to the way facts, experiences, beliefs, and events are constructed and certified as "true."[ 13] A commonly recognized example of such construction by stereotyping can be found in the area of social welfare. Quadagno and Gordon examine how welfare recipients are socially constructed as "undeserving" groups.[ 14] Gordon examines the more general construction of single mothers as an undeserving group worthy of pity but little else. Quadagno adds a discussion of the negative racial stereotypes associated with welfare that results in the association of welfare recipients with the stereotypical single African American woman who is promiscuous as well as lazy and who uses several fake identities to collect welfare checks under assumed names, "milking" the public of their hard-earned tax dollars. A classic example of social construction based on stereotype! Similarly, several scholars have examined the social construction of American Indians throughout history, first as savages and later as dependent "wards."[ 15] The shifting nature of this construction makes it somewhat more difficult to identify (for some) but it is present all the same and, depending on the construction of the times, can have a direct impact on any policies directed toward American Indian governments and individuals. Vine Deloria, in tracing the social construction of American Indians by non-Indian scientists, notes that: Regardless of what Indians have said concerning their origins, their migrations, their experiences with birds, animals, lands, waters, mountains, and other peoples, the scientists have maintained a strangle hold on the definitions of what respectable and reliable human experiences are. The Indian explanation is always cast aside as a superstition, precluding Indians from having an acceptable status as human beings, and reducing them in the eyes of educated people to a pre-human level of ignorance. ... The stereotypical image of American Indians as childlike, superstitious creatures still remains in the popular American mind--a subhuman species that really has no feelings, values, or inherent worth.[ 16] **Implications of American Indian stereotypes conveyed through social constructions range from justifications for genocide** to institutionalized racism through federal Indian law (veiled as legal reasoning for abrogating American Indian treaty rights), **dispossessing Indians of lands, water, and mineral rights, and abrogating rights of inherent sovereignty** such as criminal jurisdiction **in their own territories.**[ 17] These same social constructions continue to have ominous consequences for federal Indian policy, as illustrated by the Allotment Era, the Termination Era, and very recently by the continuing efforts of Senator Slade Gorton to get Congress to pass legislation that ignores federal trust responsibility altogether and reduces Indian programs to welfare programs by forcing means testing of tribes.[ 18] These latest efforts by Gorton are striking reminders of a warning Deloria made in the mid-1980s about the possible implications of federal policymaking that has moved away from the recognition of the special political status of tribal nations toward lumping programs for Indians in with federal programs for the poor.[ 19]

The affirmative’s failure to address the plight of Native Americans constitutes colonialism. It’s not a question of mutual exclusivity; it’s a question of priority. As long as the genocide of Native Americans is put on the back-burner in favor of discussions of criminal justice, colonialism will exist making the aff impacts inevitable. Reject the aff’s discursive framing by endorsing Indian land restoration as the First Priority. It’s the only way to solve the root cause.

**Churchill 96** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

I’ll debunk some of this nonsense in a moment, but first I want to take up the posture of self-proclaimed leftist radicals in the same connection. And I’ll do so on the basis of principle, because justice is supposed to matter more to progressives than to rightwing hacks. Let me say that the pervasive and near-total silence of the Left in this connection has been quite illuminating. **Non-Indian activists**, with only a handful of exceptions, persistently plead that they can’t really take a coherent position on the matter of Indian land rights because “unfortunately,” they’re “not really conversant with the issues” (as if these were tremendously complex). Meanwhile, they **do** virtually **nothing, generation after generation, to inform themselves** on the topic **of who** actually **owns the ground they’re standing on.** The record can be played only so many times before it wears out and becomes just another variation of “hear no evil, see no evil.” At this point, it doesn’t take Albert Einstein to figure out that the Left doesn’t know much about such things because it’s never wanted to know, or that this is so because it’s always had its own plans for utilizing land it has no more right to than does the status quo it claims to oppose. **The usual technique for explaining this away has always been** a sort of pro forma acknowledgement that Indian land rights are of course “really important stuff” (yawn), but **that one**” really **doesn’t have** a lot of **time to get into it** (I’ll buy your book, though, and keep it on my shelf, even if I never read it). Reason? Well, **one is** just “overwhelmingly **preoccupied**” **with working on “other important issues”** (meaning, what they consider to be more important issues). Typically enumerated are **sexism, racism,** homophobia, class inequities, **militarism, the environment**, or some combination of these. It’s a pretty good evasion, all in all. Certainly, there’s no denying any of these issues their due; they are all important, obviously so. But more important than the question of land rights? There are some serious problems of primacy and priority imbedded in the orthodox script. To frame things clearly in this regard, lets hypothesize for a moment that all of the various non-Indian movements concentrating on each of these issues were suddenly successful in accomplishing their objectives. **Lets imagine** that the **U**nited **S**tates as a whole were somehow transformed into an entity defined by the parity of its race, class, and gender relations, its embrace of unrestricted sexual preference, its **rejection of militarism in all forms**, and its abiding concern with environmental protection (I know, I know, this is a sheer impossibility, but that’s my point). **When all is said and done,** the society resulting from this scenario is still, first and foremost, a colonialist society, an imperialist society in the most fundamental sense possible with all that this implies. This is true because the scenario does nothing at all to address the fact that whatever is happening happens on someone else’s land, not only without their consent, but through an adamant disregard for their rights to the land. Hence, all it means is that the immigrant or invading population has rearranged its affairs in such a way as to make itself more comfortable at the continuing expense of indigenous people. **The colonial equation remains intact and may even be reinforced by a greater** degree of participation, and **vested interest in maintenance of the colonial order** among the settler population at large. The dynamic here is not very different from that evident in the American Revolution of the late 18th century, is it? And we all know very well where that led, don’t we? Should we therefore begin to refer to socialist imperialism, feminist imperialism, gay and lesbian imperialism, environmental imperialism, African American, and la Raza imperialism? I would hope not. I would hope this is all just a matter of confusion, of muddled priorities among people who really do mean well and who’d like to do better. If so, then all that is necessary to correct the situation is a basic rethinking of what must be done., and in what order. Here, I’d advance the straightforward premise that the land rights of “First Americans” should serve as a first priority for everyone seriously committed to accomplishing positive change in North America. But before I suggest everyone jump off and adopt this priority, I suppose it’s only fair that I interrogate the converse of the proposition: if making things like class inequity and sexism the preeminent focus of progressive action in North America inevitably perpetuates the internal colonial structure of the United States, does the reverse hold true? I’ll state unequivocally that it does not. There is no indication whatsoever that a restoration of indigenous sovereignty in Indian Country would foster class stratification anywhere, least of all in Indian Country. In fact, all indications are that when left to their own devices, indigenous peoples have consistently organized their societies in the most class-free manners. Look to the example of the Haudenosaunee (Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy). Look to the Muscogee (Creek) Confederacy. Look to the confederations of the Yaqui and the Lakota, and those pursued and nearly perfected by Pontiac and Tecumseh. They represent the very essence of enlightened egalitarianism and democracy. Every imagined example to the contrary brought forth by even the most arcane anthropologist can be readily offset by a couple of dozen other illustrations along the lines of those I just mentioned. Would sexism be perpetuated? Ask one of the Haudenosaunee clan mothers, who continue to assert political leadership in their societies through the present day. Ask Wilma Mankiller, current head of the Cherokee nation , a people that traditionally led by what were called “Beloved Women.” Ask a Lakota woman—or man, for that matter—about who it was that owned all real property in traditional society, and what that meant in terms of parity in gender relations. Ask a traditional Navajo grandmother about her social and political role among her people. Women in most traditional native societies not only enjoyed political, social, and economic parity with men, they often held a preponderance of power in one or more of these spheres. Homophobia? Homosexuals of both genders were (and in many settings still are) deeply revered as special or extraordinary, and therefore spiritually significant, within most indigenous North American cultures. The extent to which these realities do not now pertain in native societies is exactly the extent to which Indians have been subordinated to the mores of the invading, dominating culture. Insofar as restoration of Indian land rights is tied directly to the reconstitution of traditional indigenous social, political, and economic modes, you can see where this leads: the relations of sex and sexuality accord rather well with the aspirations of feminist and gay rights activism. How about a restoration of native land rights precipitating some sort of “environmental holocaust”? Let’s get at least a little bit real here. If you’re not addicted to the fabrications of Smithsonian anthropologists about how Indians lived, or George Weurthner’s Eurosupremacist Earth First! Fantasies about how we beat all the wooly mammoths and mastodons and saber-toothed cats to death with sticks, then this question isn’t even on the board. I know it’s become fashionable among Washington Post editorialists to make snide references to native people “strewing refuse in their wake” as they “wandered nomadically about the “prehistoric” North American landscape. What is that supposed to imply? That we, who were mostly “sedentary agriculturalists” in any event. Were dropping plastic and aluminum cans as we went? Like I said, lets get real. Read the accounts of early European arrival, despite the fact that it had been occupied by 15 or 20 million people enjoying a remarkably high standard of living for nobody knows how long: 40,000 years? 50,000 years? Longer? Now contrast that reality to what’s been done to this continent over the past couple of hundred years by the culture Weurthner, the Smithsonian, and the Post represent, and you tell me about environmental devastation. That leaves militarism and racism. Taking the last first, there really is no indication of racism in traditional Indian societies. To the contrary, the record reveals that Indians habitually intermarried between groups, and frequently adopted both children and adults from other groups. This occurred in pre- contact times between Indians, and the practice was broadened to include those of both African and European origin—and ultimately Asian origin as well—once contact occurred. Those who were naturalized by marriage or adoption were considered members of the group, pure and simple. This was always the Indian view. The Europeans and subsequent Euroamerican settlers viewed things rather differently, however, and foisted off the notion that Indian identity should be determined primarily by “blood quantum,” an outright eugenics code similar to those developed in places like Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa. Now that’s a racist construction if there ever was one. Unfortunately, a lot of Indians have been conned into buying into this anti- Indian absurdity, and that’s something to be overcome. But there’s also solid indication that quite a number of native people continue to strongly resist such things as the quantum system. As to militarism, no one will deny that Indians fought wars among themselves both before and after the European invasion began. Probably half of all indigenous peoples in North America maintained permanent warrior societies. This could perhaps be reasonably construed as “militarism,” but not, I think, with the sense the term conveys within the European/Euro-American tradition. There were never, so far as anyone can demonstrate,, wars of annihilation fought in this hemisphere prior to the Columbian arrival, none. In fact, it seems that it was a more or less firm principle of indigenous warfare not to kill, the object being to demonstrate personal bravery, something that could be done only against a live opponent. There’s no honor to be had in killing another person, because a dead person can’t hurt you. There’s no risk. This is not to say that nobody ever died or was seriously injured in the fighting. They were, just as they are in full contact contemporary sports like football and boxing. Actually, these kinds of Euro-American games are what I would take to be the closest modern parallels to traditional inter-Indian warfare. For Indians, it was a way of burning excess testosterone out of young males, and not much more. So, militarism in the way the term is used today is as alien to native tradition as smallpox and atomic bombs. Not only is it perfectly reasonable to assert that a restoration of Indian control over unceded lands within the United States would do nothing to perpetuate such problems as sexism and classism, but the reconstitution of indigenous societies this would entail stands to free the affected portions of North America from such maladies altogether. Moreover, it can be said that the process should have a tangible impact in terms of diminishing such oppressions elsewhere. The principles is this: **sexism, racism, and all the rest arose here as a** concomitant to the emergence and **consolidation of the Eurocentric nation-state** form of sociopolitical and economic organization. Everything the state does, everything it can do, is entirely contingent on its maintaining its internal cohesion, **a cohesion signified above all by** its pretended **territorial integrity**, its ongoing domination of Indian Country. Given this, it seems obvious that **the literal dismemberment of the nation-state inherent to Indian land recovery correspondingly reduces the ability of the state to sustain** the imposition of **objectionable relations within itself.** It follows that realization of **indigenous land rights serve**s **to** undermine or **destroy the ability of the status quo to continue imposing a racist**, sexist, classist, homophobic, **militaristic order** on non-Indians.
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